



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/221,250	12/28/1998	JAY S. WALKER	WD2-98-057	4901

22927 7590 09/24/2002

WALKER DIGITAL  
FIVE HIGH RIDGE PARK  
STAMFORD, CT 06905

EXAMINER

RAO, ANAND SHASHIKANT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/221,250

Applicant(s)

WALKER ET AL.

Examiner

Andy S. Rao

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-181 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-181 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. As per the Applicant's instructions as filed in Paper 16 as filed on 7/01/02, claims 180-181 has been added.
2. Claim 27-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. However, after reviewing the Applicants' remarks (Paper 16: page 7, lines 4-27; page 1-2), that rejection is withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 47-67 and 72-179 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection in addressing the newly added limitations.
4. Claims 1-46, 68-71, 87-116, and 154-173 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acosta et al., (hereinafter referred to "Acosta"), in view of Von Kohorn as was set forth in the Office Action of Paper 9 on 10/16/01.
5. Applicants' arguments filed on 7/01/02 as in Paper 16 with respect to previously pending claims 1-46 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicants present numerous arguments contending the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-46, 68-71, 87-116, 154-173 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acosta et al., (hereinafter referred to "Acosta"), in view of Von Kohorn as was set forth in the Office Action of Paper 9 on 10/16/01, and further pushes forth these numerous arguments in support of the reasons that follow. However, after a careful consideration of the arguments presented, the Examiner respectfully disagree for the reasons that follow.

With respect to claims 1, 41, 94, and 168, the Applicants argue that Von Kohorn credits uses with compensation for betting outcomes in sporting events, or game shows, but doesn't pay

Art Unit: 2613

users for watching events for amount of time for remote monitoring purposes (Paper 16: page 8, lines 14-26; page 12, lines 8-15; page 16, lines 19-21; page 18, lines 1-10). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Firstly, the Examiner will deal with the nature of payment, i.e. wager winnings or whatever. Von Kohorn clearly establishes that this is of a monetary nature (Von Kohorn: column 16, lines 40-45), so this clearly establishes that whatever payment received is financially gainful to the user. Additionally, the Examiner doesn't differentiate between a "prize" and "payment" as such, both are only received for satisfactory performance within a certain set of parameters, at least as far as it applies to the reference. There is no mention of a free prize, as the user always to perform to receive such a prize, wagers, or bet winnings. Although, for the purposes of discussion, the Examiner is more concerned with the prize aspect of compensation. Secondly, the Examiner will show support that the televised event of Von Kohorn reads on remote monitoring purposes of the claim. It is noted that televised events in the reference (Von Kohorn: column 72, lines 449-53) are stipulated as:

*"Events...include, sports, elections, polls, and other kinds of happenings, the outcomes of which are capable of being defined in terms of results, scores, points, decisions, and other measurements..."*

To the Examiner, "other kinds of happenings" is any event monitored remotely. It's a happening or possibly happening that the viewer is watching with the hopes of receiving an award. Now, the other thing to consider is that the watcher or subscriber readying for this particular event can receive payment in advance (Von Kohorn: column 72, 35-40), but can be reduced if the

subscriber fails to watch or interact with the event for the duration of event, where the deduction from the users prize money takes place on a time duration basis, where for instance, the earlier the user leaves the event, the less prize money he keeps (Von Kohorn: column 72, lines 65-68). This situation is the application of the reference that would read upon the "...amount of time..." limitation of claims 1 and 41. It is noted that the Applicants have also grouped claims 2-26 and claims 42-46 and 95-116 and claims 169-173 with claims 1 and 41 and 94 and 168 respectively, so unless argued on their own merits, they also stand rejected as discussed above.

With regards to the remarks concerning claim 5, the Applicants contend that the supporting Acosta reference fails to disclose "...determining a shift..." as an the claim (Paper 16: page 9, lines 4-9) . The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Under the auspices of the business manager (Acosta: column 14, lines 60-68), the user database contains a record of the particular services for which a particular user computer has registered for including parcels of time (i.e. shifts). That would be looked upon by the business manager would be looked upon to see if the user record of system usage corresponds the registered time, and thus determine the user would need to billed for excess usage, or if the user computer has overrun its registered time (Acosta: column 26, lines 15-25), to shut down services to the user computer based on the specified permission levels (Acosta: column 14, lines 60-68). Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that this limitation is met.

With regards to the remarks concerning claim 7, the Applicants argue that the rejection fails to address "an identity of the remote location is not communicated to the user..." as in the claim (Paper 16: page 9, lines 10-17). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The denial of access

of the remote site is highest level of the permission level tables. Based on permissions table, a user can access a site in "...demand only..." mode which the Examiner interprets as being able to access that site without having access to any information about that camera site, including its geographic location (Acosta: column 7, lines 35-40). Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that this limitation is met.

With regards to the remarks concerning claim 23, the Applicants argue that the Acosta reference fails to disclose "receiving from the user device notification of an emergency at the remote location and contacting a third party in response to received notification..." as in the claim (Paper 16: page 18-27). The Examiner respectfully disagrees.. It is noted that the first part of the cite (Acosta: column 7, lines 40-60) establishes the cameras can communicate with the central office video management system (COVMS) or "...with some other direct connection of a third party..." to the central office video management system (Acosta: column 7, lines 48-50). This establishes the use of the system with a third party communication. Now, since communication from the camera is event/trigger driven, such as an emergency, (Acosta: column 9, lines 35-45), the occurrence of an emergency would conclude with the contact of a third party either from the (COVMS), or through direct contact. However, the business manager has already arranged for that camera element to available to a user computer and coupled with the primary reference's definition that a user subscribing to a televised event such as "an other kind of happening" (i.e. an emergency) and being paid based on "decisions and results", notification of the (COVMS) or third party as the result of a viewed emergency is supported by the combination. Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that this limitation is met.

With regards to the remarks claim 25, the Applicants contend that the rejection fails to address “determining a pay rate” and “crediting a value to the user in accordance with the pay rate” as in the claim (Paper 16: page 10, lines 1-7). The Examiner disagrees. It is noted that the limitation “pay rate” can easily be interpreted to be the amount that a user has to pay, as opposed an amount that the user is to receive in payment. As such, crediting a value to a user in accordance with the pay rate equates to the amount that the user is billed. When viewed in this light, it is clear that the billing and user payment of the secondary reference (Acosta: column 14, lines 60-65), clearly reads on the claim. In response to applicants argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicants invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., payment going to the user, as opposed to payment originating from the user) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). However, the Examiner notes that even if the claim were amended to recited “...determining a pay rate to for computing an amount to be paid to the user...”, Von Kohorn would read on this as well. The primary reference discloses “an amount to be stipulated by the user...” in conjunction with the event monitoring of the reference (Von Kohorn: column 72, lines 65-68; column 72, lines 50-53). Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that this limitation is met.

With regards to the remarks concerning claim 26, the Applicants argue that the rejection fails to address “...receiving from the user device notification of an emergency at the remote location...” and “...includes paying a bonus for each legitimate emergency detected by the user...” as in the claim (Paper 16: page 10, lines 10-17). The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Art Unit: 2613

It is noted that discussion of "...receiving from the user device notification of an emergency at the remote location..." has been previously discussed. However it is repeated here. It is noted that the first part of the cite (Acosta: column 7, lines 40-60) establishes the cameras can communicate with the central office video management system (COVMS) or "...with some other direct connection of a third party..." to the central office video management system (Acosta: column 7, lines 48-50). This establishes the use of the system with a third party communication. Now, since communication from the camera is event/trigger driven, such as an emergency, (Acosta: column 9, lines 35-45), the occurrence of an emergency would conclude with the contact of a third party either from the (COVMS), or through direct contact. However, the business manager has already arranged for that camera element to be available to a user computer and coupled with the secondary reference's definition that a user subscribing to a televised event such as "an other kind of happening" (i.e. an emergency) and being paid based on "decisions and results", notification of the (COVMS) or third party as the result of a viewed emergency is supported by the combination. The "...includes paying a bonus for each legitimate emergency detected by the user..." limitation is met by the fact that in Von Kohorn where based on the viewed "...emergency..." or viewed "...other kind of happening...", the viewer is paid an amount based on a correct decision (Von Kohorn: column 72, line 53). Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that these limitations are met.

With regards to independent claim 27, the Applicants contend that Acosta fails to disclose "...assigning to a user of a data network a remote monitoring task including a remote location to monitor and a shift for monitoring the remote location..." and "...providing the user with information relating to the remote monitoring task..." as in the claim (Paper 16: page 10,



Art Unit: 2613

lines 18-29; page 11, lines 1-8). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Acosta citation (Acosta: column 26, lines 40-49) discloses allowing access to users in accordance with privileges, said privileges including allowable times (i.e. shifts). The determination of the shifts of a user computer would be determined in conjunction the user database contain a complete record of the services desired by the user including the time the user wants access to the user computer (Acosta: column 26, lines 15-25: "records of system usage"). Thus the assigning of a user to the data network a remote monitoring task with a shift status in Acosta would only allowing access to the remote monitoring location during times corresponding to the user computer's shift, as the business manager cannot deny time-based access without having already configure acceptable periods of time usages, such as shifts (Acosta: column 26, lines 40-49). As to providing information about a monitoring task (Acosta: column 7, lines 30-40), the information pertaining to the geographical location of the camera being transmitted to the COVMS, would also be made available to the authenticated users based on the permissions table (Acosta: column 26, lines 55-65). Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that these features are met. Regarding claims 28-40, unless specifically argued separately, they remain rejected based on the discussion concerning independent claim 27.

With regards to claim 37, the Applicants argue that Acosta fails to discloses "...determining an emergency procedure to be followed by the user in the event the user detects an emergency..." as in the claim (Paper 16: page 13-21). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that when combined with the Von Kohorn where the "other kinds of happenings" has been equated to the occurrence of an emergency (Von Kohorn: column 72, lines 50-51), the citation of the secondary reference (Acosta: column 7, lines 40-60; column 9, lines 35-45) take

on the following attributes. The first citation (Acosta: column 7, lines 40-60) discloses contacting a third party either by going through the COVMS or directly, as has been discussed above. The second citation (Acosta: column 9, lines 35-45) discloses that the transmission protocol would be an emergency transmission protocol being established by the COVMS. The transmission of the determined emergency transmission protocol would be conducted under the auspices of the encompassed by the business manager before setting up a user computer session (Acosta: column 15, lines 40-50). As for the user detecting an emergency, this is based on Von Kohorn's viewer of seeing the occurrence of an emergency (i.e. "other kinds of happening") and responding to the viewed event by making an appropriate decision of a emergency notification (Von Kohorn: column 72, line 52). Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that this limitation is met as well.

With regards to the remarks concerning claim 40, the Applicants argue that the rejection fails to disclose "...reminding users of the remote monitoring task prior the start of a shift..." as in the claim (Paper 16: page 12, lines 1-7). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. While Applicants noted that the citation is pertinent to an event based mode of transmission (Paper 16: page 12, lines 3-7), what they fail to ascertain is that this citation is this is actually a "before" event sub-mode based transmission (Acosta: column 11, lines 10-27). Accordingly, if the transmission sent to the user is a "before" sub-mode, and the event is the user's session, that transmission is a visual reminder to the user. Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that this limitation is met as well.

With regards to claim 44, the Applicants remark that the reference fails to disclose "...informing a user of the plurality of users that he is the only one monitoring the remote

Art Unit: 2613

location...” as in the claim (Paper 16: page 12, lines 20-28). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that the user database discloses the number of active users (Acosta: column 26, lines 40-50) which would be available to the sessions user with an appropriate permission level. Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that the limitation is met.

With regards to claims 68-74, 87-93, 154-167, the Applicants contend that the Von Kohorn reference fails to disclose “...preempting a program in response to a signal from a sensor...” as in the claims (Paper 15: page 15, lines 1-20; page 16, lines 5-20; page 17, lines 15-21)). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. While it is true that the bottom half of that cite discloses the “mixing” of video signals, what was intended to be pointed out by the Examiner what the “instructional signal” being transmitted instead of the regular signal transmission modes. That is, the instructional signal “preempting” a regular signal transmission mode. Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that this feature of “preempting” when combined with the Acosta teaching of generating event/triggered response (Acosta: column 9, lines 37-55) driven transmissions (Acosta: column 11, lines 30-50), would have the combination generating a preempting event generated display. Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that this limitation is met.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 47-67, 75-86, 117-153 and 174-181 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acosta et al, (hereinafter referred to as "Acosta") in view of Von Kohorn.

Acosta discloses a method for a central server to manage remote monitoring tasks (Acosta: column 17, lines 10-25), comprising: receiving a request from a user of a user device to monitor a remote location in exchange for compensation for a user (Acosta: column 28, lines 45-55; column 26, lines 45-55); determining a remote location to be monitored (Acosta: column 17, lines 45-65); enabling communication between a sensor at the remote location and the user device (Acosta: column 26, lines 40-68), as in claim 47. However, Acosta fails to disclose measuring user attentiveness while the user device is in communication with the sensor. Von Kohorn discloses a remote station (Von Kohorn: column 63, lines 10-16) with response reward method for crediting users for measured attentiveness (Von Kohorn: column 67, lines 65-68; column 68, lines 1-9) while watching certain video events (Von Kohorn: column 72, lines 45-55) distributed from central station in order to ensure the user's interaction with the transmitted event (Von Kohorn: column 69, lines 1-45). Accordingly, given this teaching, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the Von Kohorn response reward method into the Acosta method in order to ensure the user's interaction with the transmitted event. The Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has all of the features of claim 47.

Regarding claim 48, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has the user device being a computer (Acosta: column 8, lines 30-35), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 49, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has a step for determining a shift for monitoring the remote location (Acosta: column 26, lines 15-25), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 50-52, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has determining whether predetermined criteria have been satisfied prior enabling communication between the sensor and the user device (Acosta: column 26, lines 39-52), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 53, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has crediting value to a financial account (Von Kohorn: column 26, lines 10-40), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 54-59, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has the step of transmitting a test communication to the user at the user device (Acosta: column 71, lines 25-41; column 82, lines 26-49), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 60, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has enabling a second user to monitor the user monitoring the remote location (Acosta: column 31, lines 33-38), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 61, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has the step of causing an audible alarm to be transmitted to the user at the user if the user is not attentive (Acosta: column 27, lines 60-65), as in the claim.

Art Unit: 2613

Regarding claims 62-66, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has the step of penalizing the user (Acosta: column 27, lines 25-37), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 67, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has the step of replacing the user with an alternate user (Acosta: column 31, lines 30-37), as in the claim.

Acosta discloses a method for a user of a data network to monitor remote locations in exchange for a value (Acosta: column 17, lines 10-25), comprising: receiving a data stream generated by a sensor at a remote location (Acosta: column 28, lines 45-64); monitoring the data stream for an amount of time (Acosta: column 26, lines 40-60) as in claim 75. However, Acosta receiving credit to a user account for monitoring the data stream for that amount of time. Von Kohorn discloses a remote station (Von Kohorn: column 63, lines 10-16) with response reward method for crediting users (Von Kohorn: column 67, lines 65-68; column 68, lines 1-9) for watching certain video events (Von Kohorn: column 72, lines 45-55) distributed from central station in order to ensure the user's interaction with the transmitted event (Von Kohorn: column 69, lines 1-45). Accordingly, given this teaching, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the Von Kohorn response reward method into the Acosta method in order to ensure the user's interaction with the transmitted event. The Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has all of the features of claim 75.

Regarding claim 76, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, includes the step of transmitting an account identifier (Acosta: column 28, lines 60-65), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 77, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has the step of transmitting a task identifier (Von Kohorn: column 79, lines 20-25; column 79, lines 63-68; column 80, lines 1-41; column 82, lines 30-40), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 78, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has communication across the Internet (Acosta: column 8, lines 30-35), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 79, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has both audio and video communication (Acosta: column 55, lines 45-55), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 80, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has the credit being monetary (Von Kohorn: column 26, lines 10-40), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 81-82, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has the step of monitoring a plurality of data streams (Acosta: column 26, lines 25-30), as in the claims.

Regarding claims 83-84, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has the step of monitoring the data stream includes the step of monitoring for an emergency (Acosta: column 9, lines 35-45), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 85, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has the step of receiving a predetermined video of an emergency (Acosta: column 27, lines 55-65), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 86, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has the step of receiving queries and responding to the queries (Von Kohorn: column 71, lines 25-42), as in the claim.

Acosta discloses a method for alerting a user of a computer of an emergency at a remotely monitored location (Acosta: column 17, lines 10-25), comprising: maintaining the computer in communication with a sensor at the remotely monitored location (Acosta: column 8, lines 30-35); running a program on the computer, wherein the program is unrelated to remote monitoring (Acosta: column 6, lines 45-55), as in claim 87. However, Acosta fails to disclose the step of causing the computer to preempt a program unrelated to the monitoring to display the video data. Von Kohorn discloses a remote station (Von Kohorn: column 63, lines 10-16) with response reward method for crediting users (Von Kohorn: column 67, lines 65-68; column 68, lines 1-9) for watching certain video events (Von Kohorn: column 72, lines 45-55) distributed from central station to preempt a program unrelated to the video event (Von Kohorn: column 65, lines 20-30) in order to ensure the user's interaction with the transmitted event (Von Kohorn: column 69, lines 1-45). Accordingly, given this teaching, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the Von Kohorn response reward method into the Acosta method in order to ensure the user's interaction with the transmitted event. The Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has all of the features of claim 87.



Regarding claim 88, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, discloses using a browser (Acosta: column 8, lines 30-35), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 89, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, uses a predetermined level of motion (Acosta: column 9, lines 1-5 and 35-45), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 90, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has the step of preempting including displaying the video data (Acosta: column 27, lines 60-65), as in the claim.

Acosta discloses a method for alerting an individual of an emergency at a remote location (Acosta: column 17, lines 10-25), comprising: receiving a signal indicative of a predetermined event detected by a sensor at the remote location (Acosta: column 27, lines 60-67) as in claim 91. However, Acosta fails to disclose the step of causing a television set to preempt a program a television program display the video data. Von Kohorn discloses a remote station (Von Kohorn: column 63, lines 10-16) with response reward method for crediting users (Von Kohorn: column 67, lines 65-68; column 68, lines 1-9) for watching certain video events (Von Kohorn: column 72, lines 45-55) distributed from central station to preempt a program unrelated to the video event on a TV (Von Kohorn: column 65, lines 20-30) in order to ensure the user's interaction with the transmitted event (Von Kohorn: column 69, lines 1-45). Accordingly, given this teaching, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the Von Kohorn response reward method into the Acosta method in order to ensure the user's interaction

with the transmitted event. The Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, has all of the features of claim 91.

Regarding claim 92, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, uses a predetermined level of motion (Acosta: column 9, lines 1-5 and 35-45), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 93, the Acosta remote station managing method now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward method, of transmitting the signal to a TV set to sound an alarm to inform the user of the predetermined event detected at the sensor (Acosta: column 27, lines 60-65), as in the claim.

Acosta discloses a system for managing remote monitoring tasks (Acosta: column 17, lines 10-25), comprising: a central server and a memory device (Acosta: column 21, lines 60-68; column 22, lines 1-4); a processor in communication with the memory device, and configured to (Acosta: column 6, lines 30-40): assign to a user of a data networks a remote monitoring task (Acosta: column 17, lines 45-65) including a remote location to monitor (Acosta: column 26, lines 25-35) and a shift for monitoring the remote location (Acosta: column 26, lines 40-49); and provide the user with information relating to the remote monitoring task (Acosta: column 7, lines 30-40) as in claim 117. However, Acosta fails to disclose that the information would be transmitted to the user by the central server at the start of a shift. Von Kohorn discloses a remote station (Von Kohorn: column 63, lines 10-16) with response reward system for crediting users (Von Kohorn: column 67, lines 65-68; column 68, lines 1-9) for watching certain video events (Von Kohorn: column 72, lines 45-55) distributed from central station including information to be transmitted to the user at the start of an event in order to ensure the user's interaction with the

transmitted event (Von Kohorn: column 69, lines 1-45). Accordingly, given this teaching, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the Von Kohorn response reward system into the Acosta system in order to ensure the user's interaction with the transmitted event. The Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has all of the features of claim 117.

Regarding claim 118, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has the request including an account identifier (Acosta: column 28, lines 60-65), a task identifier (Von Kohorn: column 79, lines 20-25; column 79, lines 63-68; column 80, lines 1-41; column 82, lines 30-40), and the shift (Acosta: column 26, lines 15-25), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 119-120, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has determining whether predetermined criteria have been satisfied prior to providing the user with the information (Acosta: column 26, lines 39-52), as in the claims.

Regarding claims 121-123, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has the step of prevent a user from monitoring a remote location (Acosta: column 16, lines 55-68; column 17, lines 1-16), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 124, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has assigning a remote monitoring task based on user preferences (Acosta: column 31, lines 30-46), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 125, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has contacting a third party in response to the received notification (Acosta: column 7, lines 40-60; column 9, lines 35-45), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 126, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has the step of reminding the user of the remote monitoring task prior to the start of the shift (Acosta: column 11, lines 20-25), as in the claim.

Acosta discloses a system for managing remote monitoring tasks (Acosta: column 17, lines 10-25), comprising: a memory device (Acosta: column 21, lines 60-68; column 22, lines 1-4); a processor in communication with the memory device, and configured to (Acosta: column 6, lines 30-40): determine a remote location to be monitored (Acosta: column 17, lines 45-65); enable communication between a sensor at the remote location and a plurality of users of a data network (Acosta: column 26, lines 40-68); determine an amount of time each user of the plurality of users has monitored the remote location (Acosta: column 26, lines 35-60), as in claim 127. However, Acosta fails to disclose crediting value to each user of the plurality of users for monitoring the remote location in accordance with the amount of time that each user has monitored the remote location. Von Kohorn discloses a remote station (Von Kohorn: column 63, lines 10-16) with response reward system for crediting users (Von Kohorn: column 67, lines 65-68; column 68, lines 1-9) for watching certain video events (Von Kohorn: column 72, lines 45-55) distributed from central station in order to ensure the user's interaction with the transmitted event (Von Kohorn: column 69, lines 1-45). Accordingly, given this teaching, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the Von Kohorn response reward system into the Acosta system in order to ensure the user's interaction with the transmitted event.

The Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has all of the features of claim 127.

Regarding claim 128, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has a step for determining a shift for monitoring the remote location (Acosta: column 26, lines 15-25), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 129, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has the step of recruiting users (Von Kohorn: column 50, lines 30-50), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 130, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has informing a user of the plurality of users (Acosta: column 26, lines 15-25), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 131-132, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has contacting a third party in response to the received notification (Acosta: column 7, lines 40-60; column 9, lines 35-45), as in the claims.

Acosta discloses a system for managing remote monitoring tasks (Acosta: column 17, lines 10-25), comprising: a memory device (Acosta: column 21, lines 60-68; column 22, lines 1-4); a processor in communication with the memory device, and configured to (Acosta: column 6, lines 30-40): receive a request from a user of a user device to monitor a remote location in exchange for compensation to the user (Acosta: column 28, lines 45-55); determine a remote location to be monitored (Acosta: column 17, lines 45-65); enable communication between a sensor at the remote location and the user device (Acosta: column 26, lines 40-68), as in claim

Art Unit: 2613

133. However, Acosta fails to disclose measuring user attentiveness while the user device is in communication with the sensor Von Kohorn discloses a remote station (Von Kohorn: column 63, lines 10-16) with response reward system for crediting users for measured attentiveness (Von Kohorn: column 67, lines 65-68; column 68, lines 1-9) while watching certain video events (Von Kohorn: column 72, lines 45-55) distributed from central station in order to ensure the user's interaction with the transmitted event (Von Kohorn: column 69, lines 1-45). Accordingly, given this teaching, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the Von Kohorn response reward system into the Acosta system in order to ensure the user's interaction with the transmitted event. The Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has all of the features of claim 133.

Regarding claim 134, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has the user device being a computer (Acosta: column 8, lines 30-35), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 135, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has a step for determining a shift for monitoring the remote location (Acosta: column 26, lines 15-25), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 136-138, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has determining whether predetermined criteria have been satisfied prior enabling communication between the sensor and the user device (Acosta: column 26, lines 39-52), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 139, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has crediting value to a financial account (Von Kohorn: column 26, lines 10-40), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 140-145, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has the step of transmitting a test communication to the user at the user device (Acosta: column 71, lines 25-41; column 82, lines 26-49), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 146, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has enabling a second user to monitor the user monitoring the remote location (Acosta: column 31, lines 33-38), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 147, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has the step of causing an audible alarm to be transmitted to the user at the user if the user is not attentive (Acosta: column 27, lines 60-65), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 148-152, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has the step of penalizing the user (Acosta: column 27, lines 25-37), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 153, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has the step of replacing the user with an alternate user (Acosta: column 31, lines 30-37), as in the claim.

Acosta discloses a system for a central server to manage remote monitoring tasks (Acosta: column 17, lines 10-25), comprising: a memory device (Acosta: column 21, lines 60-68; column 22, lines 1-4); a processor in communication with the memory device, and configured to

Art Unit: 2613

(Acosta: column 6, lines 30-40): receive a request from a user of a user device to monitor a remote location (Acosta: column 28, lines 45-55); determine a remote location to be monitored (Acosta: column 17, lines 45-65); enabling communication between a sensor at the remote location and the user device (Acosta: column 26, lines 40-68), as in claim 1174. However, Acosta fails to disclose crediting value to the user in accordance with an amount of time that the user device has been in communication with the sensor and measuring user attentiveness while the user device is in communication with the sensor Von Kohorn discloses a remote station (Von Kohorn: column 63, lines 10-16) with response reward system for crediting users for measured attentiveness (Von Kohorn: column 67, lines 65-68; column 68, lines 1-9) while watching certain video events (Von Kohorn: column 72, lines 45-55) distributed from central station in order to ensure the user's interaction with the transmitted event (Von Kohorn: column 69, lines 1-45). Accordingly, given this teaching, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the Von Kohorn response reward system into the Acosta system in order to ensure the user's interaction with the transmitted event. The Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has all of the features of claim 174.

Regarding claim 175, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has the user device being a computer (Acosta: column 8, lines 30-35), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 176, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has the user device being a TV set (Acosta: column 69, lines 15-27), as in the claim.



Regarding claim 177, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has the request being received across the Internet (Acosta: column 8, lines 30-35), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 178-179, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has the step of transmitting a signal indicative of a predetermined event (Acosta: column 27, lines 60-65), as in the claims.

Regarding claims 180-181, the Acosta remote station managing system now incorporating the Von Kohorn response reward system, has the step concealing location of the remotely monitored site from the user (Acosta: column 26, lines 55-65), as in the claims.

### *Conclusion*

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy S. Rao whose telephone number is (703)-305-4813. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris S. Kelley can be reached on (703)-305-4856. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)-308-6606 for regular communications and (703)-308-6606 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-305-4700.

Andy S. Rao  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2613

**ANDY RAO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**



asr  
September 22, 2002